

REMARKS

I. Introduction

With the cancellation herein without prejudice of claims 46 to 50, claims 21 to 45 and 51 are pending in the present application. In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable, and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Applicants note with appreciation the acknowledgment of the claim for foreign priority and the indication that all copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received from the International Bureau.

Applicants thank the Examiner for considering the previously filed Information Disclosure Statement, PTO-1449 paper and cited references.

II. Correction of Typographical Errors

As an initial matter, the Examiner will note that claims 29 and 51 have been amended herein without prejudice to correct certain typographic errors.

III. Rejection of Claims 22 to 30, 39, 43, 44, and 51 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 22 to 30, 39, 43, 44, and 51 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the combination of U.S. Patent No. 6,198,168 ("Geusic et al.") and U.S. Patent No. 6,207,903 ("Wen et al."). It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Geusic et al. and Wen et al. does not render unpatentable these claims for at least the following reasons.

Claim 22 is directed to an electrical component and recites, *inter alia*, at least one feedthrough including one of a right prism and a right cylinder. The Office Action admits that Geusic et al. do not disclose a feedthrough including one of a right prism and a right cylinder. The Office Action contends that Figure 3b of Wen et al. discloses a via that includes one of a right prism and a right cylinder. Applicants respectfully disagree. In Figure 3b, vias 22 are illustrated as pyramid shaped, which is neither a right prism (e.g., a prism which has bases aligned one directly above the other and has lateral faces that are rectangles) nor a right cylinder. As such, the combination of Geusic et al. and Wen et al. does not disclose, or even suggest, all of the features included in claim 22. Consequently, it is

respectfully submitted that the combination of Geusic et al. and Wen et al. does not render unpatentable claim 22 or any claim that depends from claim 22.

In view of all of the foregoing, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

IV. Rejection of Claims 33 to 36 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 33 to 36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the combination of Geusic et al., Wen et al., and U.S. Patent No. 5,926,377 ("Nakao et al."). It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Geusic et al., Wen et al., and Nakao et al. does not render unpatentable these claims for at least the following reasons.

Claims 33 to 36 ultimately depend from claim 22 and therefore include all of the features recited in claim 22. As more fully set forth above, the combination of Geusic et al. and Wen et al. does not disclose, or even suggest, all of the features recited in claim 22. Nakao et al. are not relied upon for disclosing or suggesting the features of claim 22 not disclosed or suggested by the combination of Geusic et al. and Wen et al. Indeed, Nakao et al. do not disclose, or even suggest, the features of claim 22 not disclosed or suggested by the combination of Geusic et al. and Wen et al.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Geusic et al., Wen et al., and Nakao et al. does not render unpatentable the present claims. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

V. Rejection of Claims 37 and 38 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 37 and 38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the combination of Geusic et al., Wen et al., Nakao et al., and U.S. Patent No. 5,312,765 ("Kanber"). It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Geusic et al., Wen et al., Nakao et al., and Kanber does not render unpatentable these claims for at least the following reasons.

Claims 37 and 38 ultimately depend from claim 22 and therefore include all of the features recited in claim 22. As more fully set forth above, the combination of Geusic et al., Wen et al., and Nakao et al. does not disclose, or even suggest, all of the features recited in claim 22. Kanber is not relied upon for

disclosing or suggesting the features of claim 22 not disclosed or suggested by the combination of Geusic et al., Wen et al., and Nakao et al. Indeed, Kanber does not disclose, or even suggest, the features of claim 22 not disclosed or suggested by the combination of Geusic et al., Wen et al., and Nakao et al.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Geusic et al., Wen et al., Nakao et al., and Kanber does not render unpatentable the present claims. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

VI. Rejection of Claim 45 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 45 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the combination of Geusic et al., Wen et al., and U.S. Patent No. 5,901,050 ("Imai"). It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Geusic et al., Wen et al., and Imai does not render unpatentable claim 45 for at least the following reasons.

Claim 45 depends from claim 22 and therefore includes all of the features recited in claim 22. As more fully set forth above, the combination of Geusic et al. and Wen et al. does not disclose, or even suggest, all of the features recited in claim 22. Imai is not relied upon for disclosing or suggesting the features of claim 22 not disclosed or suggested by the combination of Geusic et al. and Wen et al. Indeed, Imai does not disclose, or even suggest, the features of claim 22 not disclosed or suggested by the combination of Geusic et al. and Wen et al.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Geusic et al., Wen et al., and Imai does not render unpatentable claim 45. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

VII. Conclusion

It is therefore respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable. All issues raised by the Examiner having been addressed, an early and favorable action on the merits is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 24, 2007 By:

Gerard A. Messina
Reg. No. 35,952

KENYON & KENYON LLP
One Broadway
New York, New York 10004
(212) 425-7200
CUSTOMER NO. 26646